



ECP-2007-LANG-617001

FLaReNet

Deliverable D1.5

Evaluation Plan

Deliverable number/name	<i>D1.5 – Evaluation Plan</i>
Dissemination level	<i>Public</i>
Delivery date	<i>31 May 2009</i>
Status	<i>Final</i>
Author(s)	<i>Nicoletta Calzolari, Claudia Soria, Paola Baroni, Sara Goggi, Monica Monachini, Valeria Quochi, Antonio Toral</i>



eContentplus

This project is funded under the *eContentplus* programme¹, a multiannual Community programme to make digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and exploitable.

¹ OJ L 79, 24.3.2005, p. 1.



Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... 2

1 INTRODUCTION..... 3

2 EVALUATION DIMENSIONS 3

3 METHODOLOGY AND TIME PLAN FOR EVALUATION..... 4

3.1 SELF-ASSESSMENT 5

3.2 SUCCESS INDICATORS 5

3.3 TIME PLAN..... 7



1 Introduction

In this document we describe the Evaluation Plan for the FLaReNet Thematic Network. The document is structured as follows: Ch. 2 contains a description of the dimensions along which FLaReNet intends to perform a self-assessment; Ch. 3 illustrates the methodologies adopted for evaluation.

2 Evaluation dimensions

The aims and objectives of FLaReNet are inherently of long-term nature, under three main respects:

- the *width* and *persistence* of the community created by virtue of the network
- the extension and strength of the *international cooperation*
- the *usefulness* and *relevance* of the *recommendations* issued.

Given the nature of these goals, it is clear that the success of FLaReNet can only be assessed on the long term.

However, it is important that FLaReNet maintains a close and steady observation of the activities undertaken, their smooth functioning and timing, in order to be able to detect possible problems in time and take the necessary countermeasures.

A number of evaluation dimensions have thus been identified, closely related to the results expected from the project: below is an extract from the Description of Work (pp. 6-7).

“In terms of concrete, measurable results, FLaReNet expectation is to achieve:

- the ***largest network of LR and HLT players***, ready to discuss information and knowledge on LRs and LT, and with appropriate mechanisms to share such information and disseminate it widely
- an ***extended picture of LRs*** and a ***recasting of its definition*** in the light of recent scientific, methodological, technological, social developments
- a ***consolidation*** of methods and approaches, common practices, frameworks and architectures
- a ***“roadmap”*** identifying areas where consensus has been achieved or is emerging vs. areas where additional discussion and testing is required, together with an indication of ***priorities***
- a ***set of recommendations*** in the form of a ***plan of coherent actions*** for the EU and national organizations
- a ***European model for the LRs of the next years.***

Bringing together the diverse approaches, efforts and technologies represented by its membership, FLaReNet will enable even greater ***progress toward community consensus.***”

The above expected results can be easily mapped onto as many *evaluation dimensions*, each of which relating to core goals of the Network.

1. Community

- 1.1. Is the network large enough²? Does it encompass all types of players³? What is its coverage, wrt. to languages and countries⁴?

² This refers to success indicator no. 1.



- 1.2. Degree of involvement⁵:
 - 1.2.1. Is the community active?
 - 1.2.2. What does FLaReNet do in order to engage the community?
 - 1.2.3. How many web site hits⁶?
 - 1.2.4. Where from?
2. *Language Resources*
 - 2.1. How much does FLaReNet contribute to extend the picture of LRs?⁷
 - 2.2. How does FLaReNet contribute to a redefinition of LRs?
 - 2.3. Is the survey of LRs appropriate and comprehensive⁸?
3. *Consolidation of methods and practices*
 - 3.1. What are the success stories identified by FLaReNet?
 - 3.2. Has FLaReNet endorsed some roadmap concerning methods and practices?
4. *Roadmap and priorities*
 - 4.1. Has FLaReNet identified a set of actions, recommendations and priorities in the field of LRs?
5. *Recommendations*⁹
 - 5.1. Does FLaReNet issue recommendations?
 - 5.1.1. Are they of the right type?
 - 5.1.2. Are they elicited in the right way?
 - 5.1.3. Are they addressed at the right recipient?
 - 5.2. What is the usefulness and relevance of the FLaReNet recommendations?
6. *International cooperation*
 - 6.1. Does FLaReNet sufficiently address the issue of international cooperation?
 - 6.2. Are the methods adequate?
7. *Awareness and Dissemination*¹⁰
 - 7.1. Is FLaReNet successful in contributing to increase the awareness of the field concerning LR&Ts?¹¹
 - 7.2. Are the mechanisms for sharing and disseminating information appropriate?

3 Methodology and time plan for evaluation

The methodology adopted by FLaReNet to perform an evaluation of its functioning is two-fold:

³ Cf. success indicator no. 2.

⁴ Cf. success indicator no. 3.

⁵ Cf. success indicator no. 7, 11.

⁶ Cf. success indicator no. 10.

⁷ See note no. 18.

⁸ Cf. success indicator no. 8 and 9.

⁹ Cf. success indicator no. 12 and 13.

¹⁰ Cf, success indicator no. 5.

¹¹ Cf. success indicator no. 4 and 6.



1. by means of a self-assessment of the criteria presented in paragraph 2. A self-assessment is issued together with each Progress Report.
2. by means of success indicators, as indicated in the FLaReNet Technical Annex and further specified below.

3.1 Self-assessment

FLaReNet constantly monitors its activities and functioning, and this is ensured by the management structure of the Network: a Coordination group composed by seven people assists the Coordinator, and one person in this staff is entirely dedicated to this project. This allows fast detection of problems and immediate take up of recovery actions. The Coordination Group maintains a weekly contact with the Steering Committee, so that awareness of initiatives and possible problems and malfunctioning is always maintained.

Nevertheless, a more formal self-assessment is planned, by which each member of the Steering Committee is asked to reply to the questions described in the first paragraph. The result of these interviews will be included in each Progress Report, starting from year two.

3.2 Success indicators

The Technical Annex contains a Table of “success indicators” that are meant to monitor the network and its achievement of results on a medium-term scale. After one year of activity, however, it resulted that some of them needed to be re-tuned under some respect, essentially because the evolution of the project led to modify some minor aspects of the management and directions of work with respect to what foreseen in a more abstract way before the beginning of the project.

The following Table, thus, lists a new version of success indicators (modifications are reported and justified in footnotes).

Indicators		Expected vs Actual					
		Year 1 (exp.)	Year 1 (act.)	Year 2 (exp.)	Year 2 (act.)	Year 3 (exp.)	Year 3 (act.)
1	Increase of the FLaReNet set of members (initial set 38) ¹²	+3 (=41)		+5 (=46)		+10 (=56)	
2	Number of SMEs / industrial content users joining the network ¹³	5		+5 (=10)		+5 (=15)	
3	Number of countries/regions agreeing to cooperate in LRs production/policies ¹⁴	10		+10 (=20)		+10 (=30)	

¹² This indicator originally was “increase of the support group”. However, during the course of the project it was decided to abandon the distinction “members vs. supporters” and to increase the network by inclusion of new “Institutional Members”, as those institutions agreeing to share the views and principles of FLaReNet.

¹³ Individual Subscribers.

¹⁴ Intended as the number of countries to which new Institutional Members belong.



4	Requests for endorsement and/or for support in projects/initiatives proposals ¹⁵	3		+3 (=6)		+6 (=12)	
5	Members' talks and presentations regarding FLaReNet topics	8		+10 (=18)		+20 (=38)	
6	Number of national and international novel events related to LRs (either realized or planned during project lifetime) ¹⁶	+1		+2		+3	
7	Number of SMEs / industrial content and language organisations attending project events	5		+5 (=10)		+5 (=15)	
9	Number of LRs in the survey/catalogue ¹⁷	1000		+500 (=1500)		+700 (=2200)	
10	Hit counts for Web pages / Web site	15K		+20 (=35K)		+25 (=60K)	
11	External Participants to the Annual Workshop	20		+20 (=40)		+20 (=60)	
12	Downloads of reports/recommendations	100		+200 (=300)		+300 (=600)	
13	Number of meetings with Ministries, foundations, other organisations elicited by network members to increase awareness and support ¹⁸	10		+10 (=20)		+10 (=30)	

¹⁵ Originally was "External citations/mentioning of FLaReNet in papers, conferences, or talks". However, it seems unlikely to be able to track down all citations of FLaReNet, and moreover, FLaReNet is not the kind of initiative that gets cited in scientific papers. On the contrary, the number of requests for endorsement of conferences and events and of requests for support is a solid indicator of the reputation of the project.

¹⁶ As the number of panels, workshops etc. connected to FLaReNet.

¹⁷ As explained in the note below, FLaReNet views the LREC Map as a tool that will allow to achieve a more accurate understanding of LR&Ts currently in use. Moreover, since the LREC Map is linked to LREC Conference submissions, it is likely to yield a better insight of the new LR&Ts being built, a piece of information that could not be achieved by means of regular surveys. We thus propose to postpone the assessment of this indicator to M18, together with the third Progress Report.

¹⁸ The original Table also contained two more success indicators. One was "contacts for the survey", and implied that the survey for D2.1a was to be carried out by means of direct contacts and questionnaires addressed to a number of players. However, the survey for D2.1a has been carried out with other modalities, as described in the deliverable, thus making this indicator no longer applicable. Another success indicator referred to the "Number of papers with keyword "language resources" in European, international, and national conferences and congresses". This indicator was clearly intended at measuring the extent to which FLaReNet would contribute to the awareness of the scientific community regarding language resources, under the assumption that an increase in the number of submissions related to language resources is a direct indicator of such a raise in awareness. However, it is plain that such a count is hard to achieve. Having said so, it is important to stress that FLaReNet is very much conscious that the field of language resources and technologies needs tools for measuring and watching trends and orientations in the production and use of language resources and tools. As a step into this direction, FLaReNet is closely collaborating with LREC to develop a Map of language resources (<http://www.lrec-conf.org/lrec2010/?LREC2010-Map-of-Language-Resources>), which will endow the LR&T players with a



3.3 Time Plan

Evaluation is performed either periodically and on a day-by-day basis. Periodic evaluations are those conducted every six months at progress reports, and they contain an in-depth check over the overall functioning and expected achievements of the network. At the same time, steady monitoring of the community and its degree of involvement and contribution to the FLaReNet activities is also necessary and is carried out by the FLaReNet Coordination Group.

very important instrument to observe the evolution and use of LRs over time. This tool will become a commonplace instrument in the LR&T community, as we have already received proposals for its use by other organizations, journals and book series.